



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,038	07/16/2003	Ghulam Nabi Qazi	U 014721-8	8894
140	7590	06/02/2008	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY LLP 26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023				MELLER, MICHAEL V
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1655				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/621,038	QAZI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael V. Meller	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-19, 21-27 and 29-56 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 20, 28, 57 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-28 and cyclosporin A in the reply filed on 7/2/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that applicant alleges that the examiner has not met his burden and states that the inventions are related products. This is not found persuasive since the examiner stated that the inventions were related as product and process of use in the restriction requirement mailed 5/18/2007 and applicant states that they are related as products which is simply not true since they were stated as noted above as product and process of use of that product and not as two products as applicant argues.

It is also noted that the examination is being limited to cyclosporin A since that is what applicant elected.

Thus claims 5-19, 21-27, 29-56 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 20, 28, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, it is confusing how “having characteristics as shown in Fig. 3” is clear in the claim. References to figures cannot be made within the context of the claim. Applicant cannot claim something which is in a figure by referring to that figure. The claim must be amended to incorporate the formula or figures content. Applicant refers the examiner to MPEP 2173.05 (s) but it is not clear what the applicant is claiming. How can the Patent Office be expected to compare the prior art with Figure 3 ?

Please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether the fraction obtained from *Cuminum cyminum* having the characteristics of Figure 3 differ and, if so, to what extent, from the *Cuminum cyminum* extract of the reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-obviousness by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Further, it is not helpful and it is confusing for the applicants to delete "figure 3" and insert, "Fig. 3".

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4, 20, 57 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1, 15, 31 of U. S. Patent No. 7070814 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the patent and the instant application are both claiming cumin (cuminum cyminum) together with cyclosporin A.

For the above reasons, the rejection is maintained since one cannot tell the difference between the figure 3 fraction and the prior art.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 20, 28, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 335627 in combination with JP 402019321.

EP teaches that cyclosporine A is known to be used to treat diabetes and used in oral form, see col. 1, lines 10-30, col. 4, lines 1-10 and the examples.

JP teaches that Cumin (*Cuminum cyminum*) is used to treat diabetes, see abstract.

It is well known that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. *In re Sussman*, 136 F.2d 715, 718, 58 USPQ 262, 264 (CCPA 1943); *In re Pinten*, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); *In re Susi*, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80; 440 F.2d 442, 445; 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); *In re Crockett*, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21; 279 F.2d 274, 276-277; 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960).

The reason or motivation to modify a reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. While there must be motivation to make the claimed invention, there is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention.

MPEP 2144 Sources of Rationale Supporting a Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103.  
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/documents/2100\_2144.htm>

Thus, to use the cumin and the cyclosporine A in the same composition would have been obvious since they were both well known at the time the invention was made to both be used individually in the art to treat diabetes. It is also noted that EP clearly teaches oral formulation thus making it obvious to use the composition yielded from the two components in oral form.

Applicants argue that the fraction from figure 3 is not disclosed in the reference, but as noted above the reference extract and that of figure 3 are deemed to be the same absent evidence to the contrary for the above reasons.

The adjustment of particular conventional working conditions (e.g., determining result effective amounts of the ingredients beneficially taught by the cited references, especially within the broad ratio/amounts instantly claimed), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Applicants also argue that the amounts of the ingredients are not obvious since applicant alleges that the parameters must first be recognized as result-effective variables but upon closer inspection of claim 2 (which is the only claim with such amounts), it claims a ratio which is exceedingly broad (0.1 to 300). Clearly with such a broad range, such amounts are obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, this type of modification would have been well within the purview of the skilled artisan and no more than an effort to optimize results.

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 571-272-0967. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael V. Meller/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655